

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/674,828  | 10/01/2003      | Steven W. Havens     | 65266-003           | 8799             |  |
| 28804   | 7590 04/13/2006 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| LAW OFFICES OF JOHN CHUPA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.<br>28535 ORCHARD LAKE ROAD |                 |                      | NGHIEM, MICHAEL P   |                  |  |
| SUITE 50  | nd bind korb    |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| FARMINGTON HILLS, MI 48334  |                 |                      | 2863                |                  |  |

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.   | Applicant(s)      |  |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| 10/674,828        | HAVENS, STEVEN W. |  |
| Examiner          | Art Unit          |  |
| Michael P. Nghiem | 2863              |  |

| before the Filling of all Appear brief  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |                                |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| •   | Michael P. Nghiem   | 2863  |                                |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add   | ress                           |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>05 April 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP  | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL  | LOWANCE.  |                                |  |  |  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:  | the same day as filing a Notice of<br>wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o  | Appeal. To avoid aba<br>idavit, or other evider<br>compliance with 37 C | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3) |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date  | The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of th   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,   | but prior to the date of filing a brief   | will not be entered b   | ecause                         |  |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co   | nsideration and/or search (see NO   |   | 00000                          |  |  |  |  |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo   | •   | 4 - 21  | than tan and fan               |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bef<br/>appeal; and/or</li></ul>  | tter form for appeal by materially re   | aucing or simplifying   | tne issues for                 |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a  |   | ected claims.   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1   |   |   | •                              |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1   | •   | mpliant Amendment   | (PTOL-324).                    |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li></ul>   |   | timely filed amendme  | ent canceling the              |  |  |  |  |
| non-allowable claim(s).   | ·   | amony mod amondme   | and damponing and              |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: 44-46.  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>5,6,15-17,22-25 and 43</u> .<br>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,7-14,18-21,26,37 and 42</u> .  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>27-36 and 38-41</u> .   |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  | it before or on the date of filing a No<br>d sufficient reasons why the affiday   | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u><br>rit or other evidence is              | ot be entered s necessary and  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | al and/or appellant fa  | ls to provide a                |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio   | •   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>   |   |   | nce because:                   |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other:  Clar Clark  MICHAEL NGHIEM  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| MICHAEL NGHIEM PRIMARY EXAMINER   |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |
| PHINARY EXAMINATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Continuation of 3. NOTE: New claims 47-50 raise new issue of definition and definiteness over the prior art of record.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Lewis et al. (US 6,455,319) teaches the claimed "system of transducers" (array of sensors 110).